

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO

3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

4 Plaintiff,

5 v.

6 FERNANDO ROSA,  
7 aka "Zoilo Reyes", aka "Zoilo Díaz" aka  
8 "Rosa Fernando", aka "Robinson De Jesús",  
9 aka "Menor", t/n "Zoilo Díaz Reyes  
Defendant.

CRIMINAL:12-894 (DRD)

10

11 MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
12 RE: RULE 11 PROCEEDINGS (PLEA OF GUILTY)

13 **I. Procedural Background**

14 On November 15, 2012, a grand jury returned an indictment against Fernando Rosa t/n Zoilo  
15 Díaz-Reyes, (hereinafter referred to as "defendant"). (Docket No.3.)<sup>1</sup> The defendant has agreed to  
16 plead guilty to count one of the indictment. Count one charges that on or about August 4, 2011, in the  
17 District of Puerto Rico and within the jurisdiction of this court, defendant having previously been  
18 deported, was found in the United States, without having obtained, prior to his re-embarkation from a  
19 place outside the United States, the express consent from the Attorney General of the United States, or  
20 his successor, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, pursuant to Title 6, United States  
21 Code, Sections 202(3), 202(4) and 557, to reapply for admission into the United States. This count also  
22 alleges that the aforesaid offense was committed after defendant was deported subsequent to conviction  
23 for the commission of an aggravated felony, all in violation of Title 8, United States Code, Sections  
24 1326(a) and (b)(2).

25

26

27 <sup>1</sup> During the change of plea hearing the defendant indicated that his true name was Zoilo Díaz Reyes. When  
asked during the colloquy why he had then signed the plea agreement as Fernando Rosa, he reaffirmed that his true name was  
Zoilo Díaz Reyes and proceeded to resign the applicable pages of the plea agreement with the name of Zoilo Díaz Reyes.

1

2

**II. Consent to Proceed Before a Magistrate Judge**

On April 22, 2013, while assisted by counsel the defendant, by consent, appeared before the undersigned in order to change his previous not guilty plea to a plea of guilty as to count one of the indictment. In open court the defendant was questioned as to the purpose of the hearing being held and was advised of: (a) the nature and purpose of the hearing; (b) the fact that all inquiries were to be conducted under oath and that it was expected that his answers would be truthful; (c) the potential consequences of lying under oath (such as a perjury charge); and (d) his right to have the change of plea proceedings presided by a district judge instead of a magistrate judge. The defendant was also explained the differences between the appointment and functions of the two. The defendant consented to proceed before the undersigned magistrate judge.

**III. Proceedings Under Rule 11, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure****A. Rule 11(c)(1) Requirements**

Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure governs the acceptance of guilty pleas to federal criminal violations. Pursuant to Rule 11, in order for a plea of guilty to constitute a valid waiver of the defendant's right to trial, guilty pleas must be knowing and voluntary: "Rule 11 was intended to ensure that a defendant who pleads guilty does so with an 'understanding of the nature of the charge and consequences of his plea.'" *United States v. Cotal-Crespo*, 47 F.3d 1, 4 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1995) (quoting *McCarthy v. United States*, 394 U.S. 459, 467 (1969)). [There are three core concerns in these proceedings]: 1) absence of coercion; 2) understanding of the charges; and 3) knowledge of the consequences of the guilty plea. *United States v. Cotal-Crespo*, 47 F.3d at 4 (citing *United States v. Allard*, 926 F.2d 1237, 1244-45 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1991)).

United States v. Hernández-Wilson, 186 F.3d 1, 5 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1999).

**B. Admonishment of Constitutional Rights**

To assure defendant's understanding and awareness of his rights, defendant was advised of his right:

1. To remain silent at trial and be presumed innocent, since it is the government who has the burden of proving his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.
2. To testify or not to testify at trial, and that no adverse inference could be made in relation to his decision not to testify.

1

3

2       3. To a speedy trial before a district judge and a jury, at which he would be entitled to see and  
3 cross examine the government witnesses, present evidence on his behalf, and challenge the  
4 government's evidence.

5       4. To have a unanimous verdict rendered by a jury of twelve persons which would have to be  
6 convinced of defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt by means of admissible evidence.

7       5. To use the subpoena power of the court to compel the attendance of witnesses.

8       Upon listening to the defendant's responses, observing his demeanor and his speaking with his  
9 attorney, that to the best of counsel's belief defendant had fully understood his rights, it is determined  
10 that defendant is aware of his constitutional rights.

11       **C. Consequences of Pleading Guilty**

12       Upon advising defendant of his constitutional rights, he was further advised of the consequences  
13 of pleading guilty. Specifically, defendant was advised that by pleading guilty and upon having his guilty  
14 plea accepted by the court, he will be giving up the above rights and will be convicted solely on his  
15 statement that he is guilty.

16       Furthermore, the defendant was admonished of the fact that by pleading guilty he would not be  
17 allowed later on to withdraw his plea because he eventually might disagree with the sentence imposed,  
18 and that if he violates the conditions of supervised release, that privilege could be revoked and he could  
19 be required to serve an additional term of imprisonment. He was also explained that parole has been  
20 abolished.

21       In response to further questioning, defendant was explained and he understood that if convicted  
22 on count one he will face the following penalties: a term of imprisonment of not more than twenty (20)  
23 years, a fine not to exceed \$250,000.00, and a term of supervised release of not more than three (3) years.

24       The defendant was also explained what the supervised release term means. Defendant was also  
25 made aware that the court must impose a mandatory penalty assessment of one hundred dollars (\$100)  
26 per offense pursuant Title 18, United States Code, Section 3013(a).

27

28

2 The defendant was advised that the ultimate sentence was a matter solely for the court to decide  
3 in its discretion and that, even if the maximum imprisonment term and fine were to be imposed upon  
4 him, he later could not withdraw his guilty plea for that reason alone. The defendant understood this.

5 **D. Plea Agreement<sup>2</sup>**

6 The parties have entered into a written plea agreement that, upon being signed by the  
7 government, defense attorney and defendant, was filed and made part of the record. Defendant was  
8 clearly warned and recognized having understood that:

9 1. The plea agreement is not binding upon the sentencing court.

10 2. The plea agreement is an agreement between the defendant, defense counsel and the attorney  
11 for the government which is presented as a recommendation to the court in regards to the applicable  
12 sentencing adjustments and guidelines, which are advisory.

13 3. The agreement provides a sentencing recommendation and/or anticipated sentencing  
14 guideline computation, that can be either accepted or rejected by the sentencing court.

15 4. In spite of the plea agreement and any sentencing recommendation contained therein, the  
16 sentencing court retains full discretion to reject such plea agreement and impose any sentence up to the  
17 maximum possible penalty prescribed by statute.

18 Defendant acknowledged having understood these explanations and all the terms and conditions  
19 of the plea agreement.

20 **E. Government's Evidence (Basis in Fact)**

21 The government presented a proffer of its evidence consistent with the version of facts of the plea  
22 agreement with which the defendant concurred. Accordingly, it is determined that there is a basis in fact  
23 and evidence to establish all the elements of the offense charged.

24 **F. Voluntariness**

25 The defendant accepted that no threats had been made to induce him to plead guilty and that he  
26 did not feel pressured to plead guilty.

---

28 2 "Plea agreement" refers to the agreement and its supplement.

## **G. Administrative or Collateral Consequences**

Defendant was explained, and he understood, that his decision to enter a guilty plea in this case may result in negative or adverse consequences for him regarding his immigration status in the United States.

## **H. Waiver of Appeal**

The defendant was warned, and he understood, that if the court accepts this plea agreement and sentences him according to its terms and conditions, he will be waiving his right to appeal the judgment and sentence in this case.

## IV. Conclusion

The defendant, by consent, has appeared before me pursuant to Rule 11, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, has entered a plea of guilty as to count one of the indictment. After cautioning and examining the defendant under oath and in open court, concerning each of the subject matters mentioned in Rule 11, as described in the preceding sections, I find that defendant is competent to enter this guilty plea, is aware of the nature of the offense charged and the maximum statutory penalties that the same carries, understands that the charge is supported by the government's evidence, has admitted to every element of the offense charged, and has done so in an intelligent and voluntary manner with full knowledge of the consequences of his guilty plea. Therefore, I recommend that the court accept the guilty plea of the defendant and that the defendant be adjudged guilty as to count one of the indictment.

Any objections to this report and recommendation must be specific and must be filed with the Clerk of Court within fourteen (14) days of its receipt. Failure to timely file specific objections to the report and recommendation is a waiver of the right to review by the district court. United States v. Valencia-Copete, 792 F.2d 4 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1986).

## SO RECOMMENDED.

At San Juan, Puerto Rico, this 9<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2013.

s/Marcos E. López  
U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE